

Remarks

Claim 1 has been amended to further specify the composition of various groups in the formulae. Support is as follows:

As to R<sup>5</sup>: See page 5 line 9 of the specification.

As to R<sup>6</sup>: See page 5 lines 10-11 of the specification.

As to R<sup>5</sup> and R<sup>6</sup> together: See examples 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10 and 11, in which in each case R<sup>5</sup> and R<sup>6</sup> together with the carbon atoms to which they are bonded form an indene, 1,2-dihydronaphthalene, cyclohexene, cycloheptene or cyclopentene ring. Please note that the phrase “with the carbon atoms to which they are bonded” has been added here, to more accurately and specifically describe the compounds. This is fairly supported by the examples just mentioned; in each case the ring structure includes the carbon atoms to which the R<sup>5</sup> and R<sup>6</sup> groups are attached.

As to R<sup>7</sup>: See page 5 lines 12-13 of the specification.

As to R<sup>8</sup>: See page 5 lines 15-17 of the specification.

As to X<sup>1</sup> and X<sup>2</sup>: See page 4 line 7 of the specification.

In addition, some small clarifying changes have been made to claims to improve the grammar and to remove parentheticals from the claim. The amendments are not intended to change the scope of the claim.

Claim 2 is now canceled.

The amendments to claim 1 are believed to resolve the §112 concerns raised by the examiner. In the office action, the examiner maintained that there was not reasonable enablement for the case when R<sup>5</sup> and R<sup>7</sup> were “monocyclic or polycyclic alicyclic hydrocarbon groups, monocyclic or polycyclic hydrocarbon groups or heterocyclic groups”; when R<sup>5</sup> and R<sup>6</sup> together form any ring; when R<sup>8</sup> is alkoxy and when X<sup>1</sup> and X<sup>2</sup> are –SR<sup>9</sup> or NHR<sup>11</sup>.

The amended claim addresses these concerns as follows:

1) the phrase “monocyclic or polycyclic alicyclic hydrocarbon groups, monocyclic or polycyclic hydrocarbon groups or heterocyclic groups” has now been eliminated from the claim. R<sup>5</sup> and R<sup>7</sup> are now defined as “a hydrogen atom or an alkyl group” and as “a hydrogen atom, an alkyl group, and alkyl aryl group, or an aryl group”, respectively. This narrower scope is believed to be clearly enabled by the specification;

2) R<sup>5</sup> and R<sup>6</sup> are now said to form specific types of ring structures, when taken together with the carbon atoms to which they are bound. The specified ring structures are the ones that the examiner acknowledged as being enabled—note that examples including each of the enumerated ring structures are present in the application (Ex. 4-8, 10 and 11);

3) R<sup>8</sup> is now specified as being alkyl; and

4) X<sup>1</sup> and X<sup>2</sup> now exclude –SR<sup>9</sup> and NHR<sup>11</sup> groups.

Therefore, applicants believe that the amendments to claim 1 adequately address the enablement issues raised in the office action.

As to the written description issue raised on page 7 of the office action, the language giving rise to the rejection has been removed from the claim. Therefore, this rejection be believed to be moot in view of the amendments presented herein.

Respectfully submitted,  
GARY C. COHN PLLC



---

Gary C. Cohn  
Registration No. 30,456  
Phone: (215) 938-1981

P. O. Box 313  
Huntingdon Valley, PA 19006